

REMARKS

Claims 11-20 remain in this application. Claims 11 and 12 were amended in this response. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The disclosure was objected to for using the term "a/b interfaces," and was further alleged that this terminology was not considered to be known by one skilled in the art. Applicant responds that, while such terminology has not been widely adopted in the United States, this terminology is commonly used in Europe, and particularly in Germany. Specifically, an "a/b interface" is a fixed term in ISDN technology specifying an interface that allows connections between analog devices and a digital ISDN telecommunication switch. A synonymous term for "a/b interface" would be "terminal adapter." Applicant believes that no further modifications are needed to the disclosure in this regard. However, Applicant is willing to work with the Examiner to establish a different terminology, if appropriate.

Claim 19 was objected to for using the term "tie line." Similar to the discussion above, "tie line" is a technical term for a fixed connection. The term "tie line" is widely used for direct connections between items such as private branch exchanges. Applicant believes that no further modifications are needed to the claims in this regard. Again, Applicant is amenable to working with the Examiner to establish a different terminology, if appropriate.

Claims 11-14, 16, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Song* (US Patent 6,289,018). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* (US Patent 6,289,018) in view of *Geiger et al.* ("Integrated Circuits for ISDN-status and future," April 1989, IEEE). Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* (US Patent 6,289,018) in view of *Duault et al.* (US Patent 6,108,336). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Claim 11 discloses a method to transmit time-slot oriented data via a packet-oriented communications network. The time-slot oriented data comprises (1) information segments for transmitting signaling information, (2) information segments for transmitting user data information, and (3) information segments for transmitting data-format-specific information. For example the time-slot oriented data can be ISDN data in the IOM-2 data format, wherein the M-, C/I-, MR-, and MX-segments of that IOM-2 data format are data-format-specific information,

because these segments are used for hardware or transport interaction between the ISDN communications devices. Claim 11 recites that the three different groups of information segments are transmitted in separate data packets via the packet-oriented communications network. Specifically, the information segments intended for transmitting the signaling information are transmitted in first data packets, the information segments intended for transmitting the user data information are transmitted in second data packets, and the information segments intended for transmitting the data-format-specific information are transmitted in third data packets.

In contrast, *Song* fails to teach these features. Instead, *Song* discloses splitting ISDN B- and D-channels, multiplexing the B-channels into B-channel-specific ATM packets, and multiplexing the D-channels into D-channel-specific ATM packets (FIG. 5, col. 2, lines 45-67). However, *Song* does not address data-format-specific information segments individually and further does not disclose transmitting the information segments intended for transmitting the data-format-specific information in third data packets. For at least these reasons, The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, neither *Geiger* nor *Duault* solve the deficiencies of *Song*, discussed above. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-20 are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any additional fees associated with the submission of this Response, including any time extension fees. Please reference docket number 112740-262.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

Customer No.: 29177

(312) 807-4208

Dated: January 5, 2006